

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LAZER & LAZER CORPORATION, :
Plaintiff, : CIVIL ACTION
:
v. :
:
AGRONOMED PHARMACEUTICALS :
LLC et al., : No. 21-2253
Defendants. :
:

ORDER

AND NOW, this 1st day of **August, 2022**, upon consideration of Plaintiff Lazer & Lazer Corporation’s (“Lazer”) and Defendants Agronomed Holdings Inc., Agronomed Biologics LLC, Agri-Kind LLC, and Agronomed Pharmaceuticals LLC’s (collectively, “Agronomed”) cross-motions for summary judgment, the parties’ responses thereto, and the parties’ replies thereon, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

- Agronomed’s Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 25) is **GRANTED**.
- Lazer’s Partial Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 26) is **DENIED**.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Agronomed’s Rule 11 Motion for Sanctions Against Plaintiff and its Counsel (ECF No. 37) is **DENIED**.¹

¹ The day after the parties finished briefing their cross-motions for summary judgment, Agronomed filed a motion for sanctions asserting that Lazer’s claims lacked legal and factual bases and should have been withdrawn prior to this stage of the litigation. (ECF No. 37.) After extensively reviewing the *hundreds* of pages that comprise the briefs and record in this action—let alone the 443 additional pages that comprise Agronomed’s Rule 11 motion and the exhibits thereto—the Court was disappointed to find that Agronomed’s Rule 11 motion does absolutely nothing more than regurgitate the arguments it made in its summary judgment submissions. It is as if Agronomed did not trust the Court enough to absorb its words when they were printed the first time, which is demonstrably untrue since the Court, as Agronomed can see here, has resolved this case entirely in its favor. The Court finds it particularly ironic that the crux of Agronomed’s wholly frivolous Rule 11 motion attacks Lazer for filing frivolous claims itself. The Court chides

The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case for statistical purposes.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Berle M. Schiller".

Berle M. Schiller, J.

Agronomed for filing this unnecessary motion, and full-throatedly denies it. *See Moeck v. Pleasant Valley Sch. Dist.*, 844 F.3d 387, 391 (3d Cir. 2016).